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Reviewer's report:

This was a pleasure to read. I have a few comments and a few suggestions for you to consider in your revisions:

1. Page 4, Line 58
   Add a citation to the sentence: "Furthermore, researchers and patients should learn together".

2. Page 5, Line 9
   The first few lines of this page discuss the benefits of training for patient partners. Is there any literature that you can include here that reports the benefits of training for researchers?

3. Page 5, Line 10
   Add a citation to the sentences: "Training needs reported by researchers..." and "Learning needs of patients include..."

4. Page 6, Line 40
   Please clarify: Did the themes identified through the two focus groups (as described on page 8) lead to the development of the learning outcomes? It is not clear to me how the focus groups related to the content of the modules.

5. Page 6, Line 56
   In the last paragraph, you mention "17 different locations". Were these locations spread across Canada? Might be worth including this information here.

6. Page 7, Line 6
   Please revise the following sentence to include the word "the" as follows: "... but it should be noted that THE ratio..."

7. Page 7, Line 12
   If possible, please include the surveys mentioned here in the additional files.

8. Page 7, Line 20
   For this paragraph, please insert a fraction (in brackets) next to the corresponding percentage to show the total number of surveys this is based on.
9. Page 9, Line 17
Please change the following sentence to include the word "be": "...also something that could not BE predicted..."

10. Page 9, Line 21
Consider placing all verbatim quotes in the results section into a table

11. Page 19, Line 20
Were healthcare providers and decision-makers/policy-makers represented at the Train-the-Trainer session? It may be worth discussing how this affected uptake and buy-in among these stakeholder groups. Or perhaps this is a limitation to be addressed by future POR curriculum.

12. Page 19, Line 24
The conclusions are not aligned with the objectives stated in the Methods section. The conclusion refers to the evaluation and demonstrated feasibility, while the objectives were to describe the process and explore the experience. Please revise to ensure clarity and consistency.
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